

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GLORIA ANN CLAYTON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:14-CV-794

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

ANNE E. GOOD,

Defendant.

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On February 20, 2015, United States Magistrate Judge Phillip J. Green issued a report and recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Plaintiff’s pro se complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim. (ECF No. 12.) Plaintiff Gloria Ann Clayton filed objections to the R&R on April 13, 2015. (ECF No. 16.)

This Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge’s findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). “[A] general objection to a magistrate’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not satisfy the requirement that an objection be filed. The objections must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.” *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995).

Plaintiff objects to the R&R because she did not consent to having this case heard by a magistrate judge. Plaintiff's objection lacks merit. This Court referred this case to the magistrate judge for all pretrial purposes and specifically authorized the magistrate judge to file a report and recommendation on all dispositive matters. (ECF No. 5.) Plaintiff's consent to have this matter heard by the magistrate judge was not required because the magistrate judge was not authorized to enter a final judgment. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (authorizing magistrate judges to enter final judgments on consent of the parties). Consistent with the order of reference and his authority under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the magistrate judge filed a report and recommendation on a dispositive matter.

This Court has reviewed Plaintiff's complaint, the R&R, and Plaintiff's objections de novo and concludes that the magistrate judge correctly determined that this case should be dismissed for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's objections to the R&R (ECF No. 16) are **OVERRULED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the February 20, 2015, R&R (ECF No. 12) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

Dated: October 15, 2015

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell
ROBERT HOLMES BELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE